

THE DOCUMENT COMPANY
XEROX

Copy
HPB

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 06 2004

FACSIMILE COVERSHEET

TO:

MAIL STOP: AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

OFFICIAL

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): 25
PART 1 OF 3 (THIS PART CONTAINS 25 PAGES OF 67 including cover sheets)
 Transmittal Letter, Extension Of Time, First Copy of Appeal Brief

FROM:

Thomas Zell
 Xerox Research Centre Europe
 6 Chemin de Maupertuis
 38240 Meylan France
 Tel.: 011-33-476615112 or 650-812-4282
 Email: tzell@xrce.xerox.com

RE:

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile
 transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office to
 Fax No. (703) 872-9306 on April 6, 2004.

Thomas Zell

(Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate)

Thomas Zell (Signature)

Application No.	: 09/683,237
Filed	: 12/05/2001
Inventor(s)	: Laurence Hubert et al.
Docket No.	: D/A1055
Confirmation No.	: 8307
Examiner	: Isaac M. Woo
Art Unit	: 2172
Title	: SYSTEM WITH USER DIRECTED ENRICHMENT AND IMPORT/EXPORT CONTROL .
Customer No.	: 25453

IMPORTANT/CONFIDENTIAL: This message is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This message contains information from the Office of General Counsel of Xerox Corporation which may be privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law which is not waived due to misdelivery. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately at the telephone number set forth above. We will be happy to arrange for the return of this message via the United States Postal Services to us at no cost to you.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

+33 0476615199

2 / 25

APR 06 2004

OFFICIAL

PATENT APPLICATION
Attorney Docket No. D/A1055

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office to Fax No.: (703) 872-9306 on April 6, 2004.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate
Thomas ZellSignature: Thomas Zell

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Laurence Hubert et al.)	Art Unit: 2172
Appl. No.: 09/683,237)	Examiner: Isaac M. Woo
Filed: December 5, 2001)	

Title: SYSTEM WITH USER DIRECTED ENRICHMENT AND IMPORT/EXPORT CONTROL

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith are an original and two copies of Appellant's Brief in the above-identified application.

- Charge \$330.00 to Deposit Account No. 24-0025. Two copies of this sheet are enclosed.
- Please charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16, 1.17 and 1.21 (but not 1.18) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 24-0025. Two copies of this sheet are enclosed.
- A Petition for Extension of Time is enclosed.
- This constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and an authorization to charge all fees therefor to the above deposit account, if not otherwise specifically requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Zell
 Thomas Zell
 Attorney for Applicant(s)
 Registration No. 37,481
 Telephone: 650-812-4282

Date: 4/6/2004

PATENT APPLICATION
Attorney Docket No. D/A1055

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office to Fax No.: (703) 872-9306 on April 6, 2004.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate
Thomas Zell

Signature: Thomas Zell

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Laurence Hubert et al.)
Appl. No.: 09/683,237) Art Unit: 2172
Filed: December 5, 2001) Examiner: Isaac M. Woo

Title: SYSTEM WITH USER DIRECTED ENRICHMENT AND IMPORT/EXPORT
CONTROL

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

Sir:

Appellant respectfully submits this Appeal Brief in the appeal of the present case to the Board of Appeals and Patent Interferences on the Notice dated January 6, 2004.

Page 1

Appeal Brief

Appl. No. 09/683,237

1. Real Party of Interest

The real party of interest in the present application is the assignee of the present application, Xerox Corporation.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

There is no related appeal or interference other than a notice of appeal has been filed for co-pending co-assigned U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/683,242 entitled "Document-Centric System With Auto-Completion And Auto-Correction", which was filed concurrently with the instant Application and similar to the instant Application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application 60/311,857.

3. Status of the Claims

Claims 1-17 and 21-23 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 8, and 21 are independent claims. A response to a restriction requirement faxed February 14, 2003 elected claims 1-17, thereby withdrawing claims 18-20 from consideration in this Application. An amendment faxed July 17, 2003 amended claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10-11, and 13 and added new claims 21-23.

Claims 1-17 and 21-23 have been finally rejected in an Office Action mailed October 10, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as the "Office Action") with similar comments with regard thereto in an Advisory Action mailed January 6, 2004, on the grounds further discussed herein. The Office Action indicates that claim 15, from which claims 16 and 17 depend, is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Status of Amendments

It is understood that all amendments to the claims made in this application have been entered and are reflected in the claims forming Appendix A hereto.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

5. Summary of Invention

The present invention generally concerns a system, method and program for authoring content while specifying and inserting therein directed searches as document service requests. A user defines the directed search with a plurality of parameters that specify exactly where and how search results are to be included in the authored content. That is, the directed search provides a mechanism for enriching an authored document with data in the form of search results, where the user authoring a document is able to specify search criteria and result parameters. (See Appellant's specification paragraphs 502-513 and Figures 4, 52, and 53.)

The parameterized specification of results in the directed search allows a user to identify, for example: (a) information providers for performing the directed search using the search criteria to obtain search results, (b) the location where to insert the search results in the authored content, and (c) the form in which the search results are to be inserted in the document. Additional parameters may be specified such as how frequently the directed search is to be performed to update the search results. (See Appellant's Figure 53 and description in Appellant's specification related thereto in paragraphs 504-511.)

By way of example, Appellant's Figure 54 illustrates a directed search specified using the user interface is shown in Appellant's Figure 53 that is inserted in authored content as a service request. The directed search service request is carried out by a meta-document server, possibly on a scheduled periodic basis, by fetching and possibly filtering and summarizing the search results that are then inserted in the authored content as specified by the location and form parameters of the directed search. (See Appellant's specification paragraph 512 and Figures 4, 53 and 54.)

Appl. No. 09/683,237

6. Issues

A first issue presented herein is whether claims 1-2, 4-12, 14, 16-21 and 23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs, U.S. Patent No. 6,138,129 in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,905,988 (hereinafter referred to as "Schwartz").

A second issue presented herein is whether claims 3, 13, and 22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs in view of Schwartz and further in view of Sieffert et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,594,662 (hereinafter referred to as "Sieffert").

7. Grouping of Claims

The claims do not stand or fall together as a group and are grouped as follows:

FIRST GROUP: Independent claims 1, 8, and 21 and dependent claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 14-17, and 23 define a first group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

SECOND GROUP: Dependent claims 2 and 9 define a second group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

THIRD GROUP: Dependent claims 4, 5 and 12 define a third group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

FOURTH GROUP: Dependent claims 3, 13, and 22 define a fourth group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

FIFTH GROUP: Dependent claims 15, 16, and 17 define a fifth group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

6. Issues

A first issue presented herein is whether claims 1-2, 4-12, 14, 16-21 and 23 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs, U.S. Patent No. 6,138,129 in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,905,988 (hereinafter referred to as "Schwartz").

A second issue presented herein is whether claims 3, 13, and 22 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs in view of Schwartz and further in view of Sieffert et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,594,662 (hereinafter referred to as "Sieffert").

7. Grouping of Claims

The claims do not stand or fall together as a group and are grouped as follows:

FIRST GROUP: Independent claims 1, 8, and 21 and dependent claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 14-17, and 23 define a first group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

SECOND GROUP: Dependent claims 2 and 9 define a second group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

THIRD GROUP: Dependent claims 4, 5 and 12 define a third group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

FOURTH GROUP: Dependent claims 3, 13, and 22 define a fourth group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

FIFTH GROUP: Dependent claims 15, 16, and 17 define a fifth group of claims that for reasons discussed below stand or fall together.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

8. Argument

A. Groups Of Claims 1-3 Are Patentable Over Combs and Schwartz

Appellant traverses the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-12, 14, 16-21 and 23 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs in view of Schwartz.

Claim 1 is discussed in this section as the representative claim of the independent claims 8 and 21 of the first group (which includes dependent claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 14-17, and 23). The instant rejection is set forth on pages 2-6 of the Office Action mailed October 6, 2003.

Generally, Combs discloses a method and apparatus that provides linking of matching content within and/or between one or more documents. As outlined in Figure 1, the method includes extracting text and location characteristics of an electronic document in a pattern dictionary data structure (see column 2, lines 64-67). Subsequently, a search/link tag is defined and a set of search/link parameter(s) are assigned thereto. The tag is a label for a set of parameters and rules to perform search and/or link operations between one or more documents (see column 3, lines 45-53). The search/link parameters include context, location and/or display attributes (see column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 3). Finally, the search and/or link is performed and the results displayed and/or stored (see column 5, lines 47-51).

Generally, Schwartz discloses a method and apparatus for arranging information taken from a large database into an organizational topology. More specifically, Schwartz discloses a method and apparatus for transforming information obtained from a database into a presentation network topology for seamless serial presentation of selected data items to a user. The presentation network topology is a multidimensional network synthesized according to a predetermined set of rules that is constructed to allow for adaptive playback. (See summary and abstract of Schwartz and Figure 2A which is described briefly at column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 21.)

Appellant respectfully submits that Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz fails to disclose or suggest one or more of the following elements when read as a whole of Appellant's invention recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 21:

Appl. No. 09/683,237

- (A.1) specifying a directed search *while* authoring a document,
- (A.2) inserting the directed **search** in the document being authored.

A.1 Specifying A Search While Authoring A Document Is Not Disclosed or Suggested

In this section, Appellant submits that Combs when read singly or in combination with Schwartz fails to disclose or suggest as claimed and taught by Appellant, a service for specifying a directed search while the document is being authored with an editor.

First, Appellant submits that neither Combs nor Schwartz disclose or suggest *authoring a document with a document editor* as claimed by Appellant. The Office Action alleges on page 3, line 3 that Combs discloses the use of a document editor at "102, 104, fig. 1, col. 2, lines 45-64". Further, the Office Action alleges on page 3, lines 3-5 that the "disclosed system of Combs is [an] electronic document [editor] for converting] to HTML format or SGML format". Appellant respectfully disagrees because the cited sections of Combs (specifically, step 104 in Figure 1 and the discussion in column 2 at lines 54-63) instead concerns the receipt of an electronic document defined in Combs' step 104 shown in Figure 1, which receipt may include further processing such as scanning and format conversion. Such content transformation does not involve authoring with a document editor as claimed by Appellant.

Second, Appellant further submits that neither Combs nor Schwartz disclose or suggest *specifying a directed search while a document is authored with a document editor*, as claimed and disclosed by Appellant. The Office Action alleges on page 3, lines 6-7 that Combs discloses the specification of a directed search while a document is authored with a document editor as claimed by Appellant because Combs discloses the specification of a "search/link tag by [a] user, [at] col. 3, lines 45-67 to col. 4, lines 1-7". Instead, Appellant submits that the search/link tag disclosed by Combs whether or not specified by a user fails to disclose or suggest a directed search with information provider parameters as claimed by Appellant because the search/link tag disclosed by Combs is used to specify "character hit patterns" that are detected in both the source and target documents to perform intra-document or inter-document cross-linking. (See columns 3 and 4 of Combs.) That is, the specification of character hit patters would not be necessary if linking is performed while authoring a document.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

Unlike Combs, Appellant contemplated that "in authoring document content the service enables a user to request enrichment of identified content so that enrichment identified by [a] meta-document server may be integrated in real-time as a document is being authored" (See the last sentence of paragraph no. 503 of Appellant's specification). Combs in Figure 1 clearly specifies, receiving a document, and subsequently, extracting its text and location characteristics. If Combs had contemplated defining the search/link tag while the document is authored to link authored content with other information, the step 106 in Combs Figure 1 of extracting text and location characteristics would not be necessary, as that information would already be known.

Further if construed as alleged in the Office Action, Appellant submits that Combs does not disclose inserting a search/link tag while a document is authored with a document editor. As set forth above, the use of a document editor is never disclosed or suggested by Combs. Instead, Combs only discloses that input devices (e.g., keyboard, mouse, etc.) may be used to "specify search objects, search parameters, and/or enter other commands to control the various functions of the system" (see Combs in column 6 at lines 33-45). Thus, Combs fails to disclose or suggest specifying a directed search while a document is authored, as claimed by Appellant.

Similarly, Schwartz in combination with Combs neither suggests nor discloses defining a directed search while a document is authored as claimed and disclosed by Appellant. Schwartz instead concerns a method for serially presenting data in large databases according to desired search parameters. Schwartz does not concern document authoring with a document editor as claimed by Appellant. Instead, Schwartz concerns the arrangement of "information taken from large databases into an organization topology that allows for seamless, sequential presentation of at least a subset of this information to a user" (see Schwartz, column 1, lines 24-27).

Accordingly, Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz fails to disclose or suggest having a user define a directed search using a directed search service while authoring a document with a document editor, as claimed by Appellant in claim 1 and as shown in Appellant's Figures 52 and 53 described in paragraph numbers 502-513.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

A.2 Inserting A Search In An Authored Document Is Not Disclosed or Suggested

In this section, Appellant submits that when read singly or in combination, Combs and Schwartz fail to disclose or suggest as claimed and taught by Appellant, inserting a directed search in a document as a document service request. Included as part of the directed search are search criteria and result parameters (which include information provider parameters and location parameters).

The Office Action on page 3, lines 8-9, alleges that Combs' disclosure concerning the definition of a search/link tag at column 3, line 45 through column 4, line 7, discloses inserting a directed search in a document as a service request while the document is being authored. Instead, Combs in the cited section describes parameters for specifying character hit patterns so that they extend beyond literal character matches. Thus, the cited section never discloses or suggests inserting a directed search in a document as taught and claimed by Appellant.

Appellant's invention enables concurrent use of a document editor and a directed search service to provide enrichment of identified content *while* a document is being authored. Once the directed search is specified and inserted into the document being authored, a meta-document server subsequently performs the directed search specified in the document service request by querying information providers specified in the result parameters of the directed search with search criteria specified in the directed search.

Combs singly or in combination with Schwartz fails to disclose inserting service requests *while* authoring a document, and carrying out the service request with a server that inserts the search results, as claimed by Appellant. Further, while Combs and Schwartz both teach systems for processing data, neither consider embedding in a document a service request that specifies a directed search, as claimed and described by Appellant.

A search/link operation described in Combs is not a directed search that is inserted in a document as a service request as claimed by Appellant. The search/link operation in Combs concerns a linking action that is to take place *within* or *between* selected documents. That is, the source/link operation requires a source document and a target document, where the target document may be either the source document

Appl. No. 09/683,237

(e.g., cross-linking within a document) or another document (e.g., cross-linking between documents). (See Combs column 6, lines 58-64.)

Consequently, Combs does not contemplate inserting its search/link tag defined at 108 in Figure 1 in a document it receives at 104 in Figure 1. As set forth in column 3, lines 45-53, Combs discloses that a search/link tag "serves as a label for a set of parameters and associated set of 'rules' that are used to perform a search and/or link operation with the electronic document" received and/or between one or more additional electronic documents. Further Combs discloses the use of "lexicons" for defining relations between character patterns and pattern locations (e.g., a table with filename, page number, text pattern, box coordinates, and/or other location information or tags", see Combs column 3, lines 40-44). However, Combs neither discloses nor suggests inserting its identified relations and/or search/link tags in a document. Combs uses relations and the search/link tags to do no more than carry out search and/or link operations within or between documents.

In addition, the Office Action acknowledges on page 4, lines 5-7 that "Combs does not explicitly disclose the information provider parameters identifying one or more information providers". Appellant submits that the reason Combs fails to disclose information providers is that Combs concerns the cross-linking of character hit patterns identified in source and target documents. That is, while Combs discloses a system that enables the cross-linking of matching content between target and source documents, Appellant's claimed invention concerns the definition of directed searches which specify search criteria used by information providers defined in the directed searches to obtain search results using an information provider and insert them in the document. Unlike Appellant, Combs discloses a system that performs matching and/or linking of content between source and target documents.

The Office Action on page 4, lines 7-10 combines Combs with Schwartz and alleges that because Schwartz teaches that "search parameters are accepted and [a] search engine [is selected], see (col. 14, lines 20-54), [Schwartz] teaches that a user can [specify] a parameter for a search engine (information provider) for performing searching and providing search results". However, the method and apparatus for

Appl. No. 09/683,237

transforming information obtained from a database into a presentation network disclosed by Schwartz (including the sections cited in the office action) fails to disclose or suggest the *specification* and the *insertion* of a directed search (which includes search criteria that identify information providers to perform the directed search and results parameters that specify a form in which the search results are to be inserted into the document) *into a document being authored using a document editor* as claimed by Appellant.

Instead, Combs read in combination with Schwartz describes a system in which the electronic documents received as input by Combs (i.e., at step 104 in Figure 1) are received as a result of activating "a web browser [that], selects a search engine if one is to be used, initiates, the user's search request, and locations information sources of interest" (see column 14, lines 36-38, of Schwartz). Thus, by changing the input stage of Combs to include that of Schwartz does not change the processing stage of Combs, namely generating links within and/or between documents for matching content. Consequently, neither Combs or Schwartz disclose or suggest inserting a directed search in a document while the document is authored.

Further, even if Combs were read to include the ability to access information providers at step 112 in Figure 1 in view of Schwartz's description related to its search driver module (see column 17, lines 33-67 of Schwartz), Combs fails to described or suggest Appellant's claimed invention. Interpreted in such a way requires an additional step and not a modification of a step because Combs' use of search/link parameters is to link matching content within or between documents, which is, in and of itself, performing a search with identified documents and not with documents identified by querying an information provider. Thus, Combs read singly or in combination with Schwartz neither discloses nor suggest Appellant's claimed invention recited in independent claim 1.

Further, performing the search/link operation described by Combs does not involve querying information providers specified in the directed search because the documents used by Combs relate to known and/or provided source and target documents (e.g., provided at step 104 in Figure 1). The search/link operation at 112 in

Appl. No. 09/683,237

Figure 1 of Combs is performed "according to the specified set of parameters and associate rules" (see Combs column 5, lines 48-49) which "provide 'meaning' beyond literal character patterns" (see Combs column 3, line 52). Thus, the search/link operation is not a service for gathering results by searching identified information providers as claimed by Appellant, instead it is an operation that links matching content in identified documents.

Further, Combs discloses that when the character hit pattern of the source search/link tag and character hit pattern of the target search/link tag match exactly, links may be drawn between the documents, and in this way Combs links terms within a document (e.g., table of contents to other parts of document) and between documents (e.g., manuals). (See columns 5 and 6 of Combs.) Combs whether read singly or in combination with Schwartz thus fails to disclose or suggest inserting a directed search that serves to identify where to insert search results received from searches carried out at information provides, as claimed by Appellant.

A.3 Summary of A.1-A.2

In summary, as set forth above Appellant independent claim 1 recites both the specification of a directed search while authoring a document and the insertion of the directed search as a document service request in the document, neither features of which are disclosed or suggested by Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz. Instead, Combs concerns the linking of matching content between selected source/target documents, while Schwartz concerns the arrangement of information taken from a database into an organizational topology for subsequent sequential presentation.

In view of the distinguishing features of Appellant's claimed invention set forth in representative claim 1 discussed above, Appellant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 21 are patentably distinguishable over Combs in view of Schwartz. Insofar as dependent claims 6, 7, 10, 11, 14-17, and 23 are concerned, these claims depend from one of now presumably allowable claims 1, 8, and 21 and are also believed to be patentably distinguishable over Combs in view of Schwartz.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

A.4 Group 2 Claims Are Patentable On Their Own

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 9 forming the second group of claims, the Office Action on page 4, lines 17-18, alleges Combs in column 4, lines 1-30 "discloses that the form parameters are one of a link, content, and metadata". Claim 2 is discussed in this section as the representative claim of the second group. Appellant respectfully traverses because in the section of Combs cited in the Office Action, Combs discloses the extraction and storing of text and location characteristics of an electronic document (see Combs, column 2, lines 64-65).

More specifically, the section of Combs cited in the Office Action discloses that the "text and location characteristics are stored in a pattern dictionary data structure, referred to as a 'lexicon'" (see Combs, column 2, lines 66-67), where "the lexicon is a data structure that correlates character/image information (e.g., character patterns specified by ASCII codes) of the electronic document(s) with a relative location or displacement (e.g., particular file, page, line, box, tag, character offset, etc.) where the character/image information occurs within the document" (see Combs, column 3, lines 1-6).

Appellant submits that the use of lexicons as disclosed by Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz does not disclose inserting a directed search while a document is authored, where the directed search includes form result parameters that are one of link, content, and metadata. While Combs discloses that "search parameters may include context, location, and/or display attributes", and that "a display attribute may be selected that corresponds to one or more colors for highlighting and displaying source and/or target hits of a link operation" (see Combs, column 4, lines 2-3 and column 5, lines 40-43), "no display attribute" discloses or suggests changing the form in which search results are inserted in a document as claimed by Appellant, as Combs only concerns the attributes of identified links identified between documents. Thus, Combs neither discloses nor suggest inserting search parameters in a document where the search parameters define the form in which search results are inserted into the document, which form may be one of a link, content, and metadata.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits that for these reasons and the

Appl. No. 09/683,237

reasons set forth above regarding independent claims 1 and 8, dependent claims 2 and 9 are patentably distinguishable over Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz.

A.5 Group 3 Claims Are Patentable On Their Own

Regarding dependent claims 4, 5 (which depends on claim 4), and 12 forming the third group of claims, the Office Action on page 5, lines 1-3, alleges Combs in column 3, lines 45-67 "discloses that the information provider parameters include language, quality, quantity, and cost". Claim 4 is discussed in this section as the representative claim of claim 12 of the third group. Appellant respectfully traverses because in the section of Combs cited in the Office Action, Combs discloses the definition of a search/link tag, where "the tag serves as a label for a set of parameters and associated set of 'rules' that are used to perform a search and/or link operation" (see Combs, column 3, lines 47-49).

Appellant respectfully submits that the definition of or use of the "search/link tag", which "search parameters may include context, location and/or display attributes", described by Combs in column 4, lines 2-3, fails to identify any of the following information provider parameters claimed by Appellant that include language, quality, quantity, and cost. This lack of disclosure and suggestion by Combs exists because Combs never suggests or discloses querying information providers as discussed above.

Further, for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, Combs taken in combination with Schwartz does not consider the specification of information provider parameters because interpreted in such a way requires an additional step and not a modification of a step because Combs' use of search/link parameters is to link matching content within or between documents. Further, while a user in Combs specifies source/target document(s) (see Combs column 2, lines 54-63), a user in Schwartz specifies search criteria (see Schwartz column 12, lines 32-48). Thus, neither Combs nor Schwartz singly or in combination disclose the specification of information providers, and with parameters that include language, quantity, quality, and cost as claimed by Appellant.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits for these reasons and the reasons

Appl. No. 09/683,237

set forth above regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 21, dependent claims 4 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz. Insofar as claim 5 is concerned, claim 5 depends on now presumably allowable claim 4 and is also believed to be patentable over Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz.

B. The Fourth Group Of Claims Is Patentable Over Combs, Schwartz, and Sieffert

Appellant traverses the rejection of dependent claims 3, 13, and 22, defining the fourth group of claims, as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs in view of Schwartz and further in view of Sieffert. Claim 3 is discussed in this section as the representative claim of the claims 13 and 22 of the fourth group. The Office Action in section 6 on pages 6-7, alleges Sieffert in column 3, lines 22-44 specifies, as claimed by Appellant, how frequently Appellant's directed search inserted in a document as a document service request is to be performed by querying the information providers specified in the directed search.

Generally, Sieffert discloses a system for monitoring resources residing on a network over a time interval. (See Sieffert column 3, lines 24-26.) Appellant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that Combs, taken singly or in combination with Schwartz and/or Sieffert, fail to disclose or suggest enabling recurrent performance of the directed search using a scheduler, where the directed search inserted in the document is selected and initiated at a frequency specified in the form parameters of the directed search as set forth in Appellant's claim 3.

More specifically, while Sieffert discloses "a system executive that constructs a set of resource identifiers scheduled to be searched", where "each resource includes a search date that indicates when the resource is to be searched within [a] monitoring period" (see Sieffert column 3, lines 30-31 and column 6, lines 20-22), Sieffert taken singly or in combination with Combs and Schwartz fail to disclose or suggest authoring a document with a document editor and specifying a directed search with search parameters that define how frequently the directed search is to take place.

Accordingly, Appellant respectfully submits for these reasons and the reasons set forth above regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 21, dependent claims 3, 13, and

Appl. No. 09/683,237

22 are patentably distinguishable over Combs taken singly or in combination with Schwartz.

C. The Fifth Group Of Claims

Regarding the fifth group of claims consisting of claims 15, 16, and 17, Appellant notes for the record regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 8 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Combs in view of Schwartz that as the Office Action in section 7, on pages 7-8 indicates claim 15 is allowable subject matter if rewritten to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims, claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and should therefore be allowable subject matter as well if claim 15 were rewritten to include all of the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Conclusion

Based on the arguments presented above, claims 1-17 and 21-23 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Appellant therefore respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reconsider this application, reverse in whole the decision of the Examiner, and pass this application for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Zell

Thomas Zell
Attorney for Appellant
Registration No. 37,481
Telephone: 650-812-4282

Date: April 6, 2004

Appl. No. 09/683,237

APPENDIX A

Claims

1. A system for enriching a document, comprising:

a document editor for authoring the document;

a directed search service for (a) receiving input specifying a directed search while the document is authored with the document editor and (b) inserting the directed search in the document as a document service request; the directed search including search criteria and result parameters; the result parameters including information provider parameters, location parameters and form parameters; the information provider parameters identifying one or more information providers to perform the directed search and provide search results; the location parameters identifying where in the document the search results are to be inserted; and the form parameters specifying a form in which the search results are to be inserted into the document; and

a meta-document server for (i) performing the directed search specified in the document service request by querying the information providers specified in the result parameters of the directed search with the search criteria specified in the directed search and (ii) inserting the search results in the document using the location parameters and form parameters that identify the location and the form to insert the search results in the document.

2. The system according to claim 1, wherein the form parameters are one of a link, content, and metadata.

3. The system according to claim 1, wherein one form parameter specifies how frequently the directed search is to be performed wherein the meta-document server further comprises a scheduler for selecting the document service request at the specified frequency and for initiating and managing communication with the information providers specified in the result parameters of the directed search.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

4. The system according to claim 1, wherein the information provider parameters include language, quality, quantity, and cost.

5. The system according to claim 4, wherein the search criteria includes means for specifying information providers according to a user defined criteria.

6. The system according to claim 1, wherein the meta-document server performs the directed search using the search criteria and the information provider parameters by fetching, filtering and summarizing the search results.

7. The system according to claim 1, wherein the parameters of the directed search specified in the document service request are defined in the document using XML tags.

8. A system for enriching a document, comprising:

a user interface for specifying a directed search while authoring a document, said user interface further comprising:

means for receiving input specifying search criteria of the directed search;

means for receiving input specifying result parameters; the result parameters including information provider parameters, location parameters and form parameters; the information provider parameters identifying one or more information providers to perform the directed search and provide search results; the location parameters identifying where in the document the search results are to be inserted; and the form parameters specifying a form in which the search results are to be inserted into the document; and

Appl. No. 09/683,237

means for inserting the directed search in the document as a document service request; and

a meta-document server communicating with the user interface for carrying out the directed search specified in the document service by (i) querying the information providers specified in the result parameters of the directed search with the search criteria specified in the directed search and (ii) inserting the search results in the document using the location parameters and form parameters that identify the location and the form to insert the search results in the document.

9. The system according to claim 8, wherein the form parameters are one of a link, content, and metadata.

10. The system according to claim 8, wherein the directed search parameters of the directed search are defined in the document using XML tags.

11. The system according to claim 10, wherein the meta-document server performs the directed search by fetching, filtering, and summarizing the search results.

12. The system according to claim 8, wherein the information provider parameters include language, quality, quantity, and cost.

13. The system according to claim 12, wherein the form parameters specify how frequently the directed search is to be performed, and wherein the meta-document server further comprises a scheduler for selecting the document service request at the specified frequency and for initiating and managing communication with the information providers specified in the result parameters of the directed search.

Appl. No. 09/683,237

14. The system according to claim 8, further comprising means for exporting the document for import at other meta-document servers.

15. The system according to claim 14, further comprising means for importing an exported meta-document, said importing means creating a new meta-document with:

first means for adding services in the new meta-document available at an importing meta-document server with services that map exactly to a predefined categorization; and

for those services not added by said first adding means but specified in the exported meta-document, second means for adding services in the new meta-document available at the importing meta-document server with services that map partially to a predefined categorization, and have at least one dictionary and one key in common.

16. The system according to claim 15, wherein dictionaries of two services are equivalent if they map to the predefined categorization.

17. The system according to claim 15, wherein two keys of a service map if they both reduce to a common generic key.

21. A method for enriching a document, comprising:

authoring the document with a document editor;

receiving user input specifying a directed search while the document is authored with the document editor; the directed search including search criteria and result parameters; the result parameters including, location parameters and form parameters; the information provider parameters identifying one or more information providers to perform the directed search and provide search results; the location parameters identifying where in the document the search results are to be inserted; and the form

Appl. No. 09/683,237

parameters specifying a form in which the search results are to be inserted into the document;

inserting the directed search in the document as a document service request;

performing the directed search by using the search criteria and the information provider parameters specified in the directed search to acquire search results; and

inserting the search results in the document using the location parameters and the form parameters.

22. The method according to claim 21, wherein said performing further comprises:

performing the directed search at a frequency specified in a form parameter; and

performing the directed search using the search criteria and the information provider parameters to fetch, filter and summarize the search results.

23. The method according to claim 22, wherein the directed search parameters of the directed search are defined in the document using XML tags.